

## TITLE

### AIRCRAFT CATASTROPHIC SECURITY SYSTEM

Inventor: Stephen Gregory Kimmet

### RELATED APPLICATIONS

5           The application claims the benefit of U.S. Provisional Patent Application Serial  
No. 60/324,706, filed September 25, 2001.

### BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION

10           The present invention relates to an aircraft catastrophic security system, wherein  
ways are provided to generate aircraft danger signals, to sense the aircraft danger signals,  
to place an aircraft into a controlled, restricted state, to signal externally any dangerous  
aircraft conditions and the control state of the aircraft, to inform national and local  
authorities of the aircraft's condition, to remotely, controllably operate the aircraft, and to  
enforce safe disposition of the aircraft.

15           More particularly, the present invention deals with an aircraft catastrophic  
security system that allows danger signal personnel and on-board aircraft equipment to  
signal danger in an aircraft by use of danger signal devices, wherein an on-board aircraft  
processing device monitors for such signals and, if received, the on-board aircraft  
processing device signals an on-board aircraft control device to place the aircraft into a  
controlled, restricted state and then the on-board aircraft processing device communicates  
20   this dangerous condition and the state of the aircraft control to authorized external  
processing devices and personnel, or in special cases the external authorized personnel  
can take control of an aircraft that may be having problems without the aircraft's  
knowledge, in either case the external processing device and authorized personnel can

remotely control aircraft by way of the on-board aircraft control device, so as to enforce the safe disposition of the aircraft.

Most particularly, the present invention deals with an aircraft catastrophic security system that comprises an on-board aircraft processing device that can transmit danger  
5 signals that are generated by on-board authorized danger signal personnel and devices.

On board danger signal personnel include flight attendants, plain clothes security officers, pilots, and others. These personnel use danger signal devices like small personal beeper devices, phones, and devices placed in on-board consoles, or in the flight cockpit. The act of signaling a dangerous condition may involve a special code and special procedure,

10 so that nuisance signaling of the system could be avoided. An on-board aircraft processing device monitors for danger signals and if it receives a danger signal, then the on-board aircraft processing device signals an on-board aircraft control device, or if external authorized personnel sense a danger on the aircraft, the external processing device signals an on-board aircraft control device, that places the aircraft into a  
15 controlled, restricted operating state, where the state may allow only minor adjustment to the aircraft controls or the state may be as simple as forcing the aircraft to stay at a certain altitude until the danger signal has been analyzed. In either state, the on-board aircraft processing device automatically transmits to the external processing device and authorized external personnel the existence and details associated with the aircraft's  
20 dangerous condition, and national and local authorities would be communicated the conditions on the aircraft. In addition, external authorized personnel would communicate through verbal and/or electronic control methods of communications with the aircraft crew, on-board security personnel, aircraft environmental conditions, and aircraft

operating signals to decide on the proper state that the aircraft controls should be place therein, and, subsequently, enforce where and when the aircraft would be safely disposed. Existing airports may be used or new airfields may be built as part of the present invention, in order to safely return the aircraft, passengers, crew, and cargo to the ground and to safely protect the life and property below a flying aircraft. If new airfields are used they may be built across a nation, and elsewhere, in a location that is lightly populated and is remote from strategic sites. All flights of aircraft that experienced the generation of a danger signal could be forced to land under external authorized control, even if the danger signal was a false alarm signal.

Currently, hijackers are taking over aircraft and personally flying the aircraft as bombs into buildings. This results in enormous loss of life, disruption of government, and loss of property. Typically, the hijackers will physically harm crew members and then take full control of the aircraft, because there is no instrument control function to stop them from immediately taking over from the pilot and co-pilot. In addition, if an aircraft experiences a major equipment malfunction, the results can be just as catastrophic. Some of the sources of major aircraft equipment problems can be the result of the malfunction of the equipment, improper maintenance, environmental conditions, improper handling of the aircraft, hijacking of the aircraft, and an explosion on-board the aircraft. If terrorists get control of the aircraft they can virtually fly the aircraft where they desire, while national defenses may need to shoot the plane down, which can have catastrophic results on the ground as well. There also are cases where an aircraft may not be functioning properly or may not be flying properly and the conditions are not obvious on-board the aircraft. In some of these cases communications with the aircraft are not

good and external control cannot be gained, but the consequences of such flight may also be catastrophic.

## SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

To solve the aforementioned problems, the present invention provides a system  
5 that will counteract the sources of dangerous aircraft problems. The present invention  
allows, among others, the crew, on-board security personnel, and various aircraft control  
functions to signal that a dangerous condition exists. The on-board aircraft processing  
device continuously senses these signals, identifies the source of the signal, may alert the  
crew, alerts external processing devices and external authorized personnel, and places the  
10 aircraft into a controlled, restricted state. Upon receiving the dangerous condition signal,  
the external authorized personnel make plans to determine the source of the problem, the  
aircraft's location, heading, elevation, possible planned destinations, and its potential  
impact on life, government, and property. In special cases where an aircraft is not aware  
of its improper functioning or flying pattern or the aircraft cannot be communicated with,  
15 then the external authorized personnel may decide to take control of the aircraft. At that  
point, if it is possible and desired, external processing devices and authorized personnel  
may communicate with aircraft crew members to determine the conditions that the  
aircraft crew is operating under and to get their input on the dangerous condition's source  
and to determine what, if any, limited control that might be returned to the aircraft. If  
20 conditions warrant, the external authorized personnel then determine where and when the  
aircraft will be safely disposed. Following the receipt of the dangerous signal from the  
aircraft the on-board aircraft processing device would inform national and local

authorities of the conditions, so as to help in properly and safely handling the disposition of the aircraft.

Various objects and advantages of this invention will become apparent to those skilled in the art from the following detailed description of the preferred embodiment, when read in light of the accompanying drawing.

#### BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWING

Fig. 1 is a flow chart of the logic that the aircraft catastrophic security system operates under.

#### DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE PREFERRED EMBODIMENT

Referring to Fig. 1, there is illustrated an aircraft catastrophic security system flow chart of the process that embodies the invention. The aircraft catastrophic security system monitors and controls the operating state that the aircraft is working under, at any given point in time. Initially, the aircraft is set to be operated in a normal state. If, however, the aircraft has been placed into a controlled, restricted operating state, then merely powering the aircraft down, and then back up, will not allow a controlled, restricted state condition to be set back to the normal state. The controlled, restricted operating state will be retained in the aircraft catastrophic security system even upon a total aircraft electrical and engine power down. Under the controlled, restricted operating state, only a control signal directed by external authorized personnel can clear the controlled, restricted state or return limited control to the aircraft.

To start off the process, an aircraft is placed into the normal state of operation, where the aircraft will be allowed to be controlled by on-board personnel, in much the same manner that it would be controlled, if it did not use this system.

Authorized on-board, danger signal personnel might be flight attendants, plain clothes security officers, pilots, and others. Security officers would not necessarily be known by the crew of the aircraft and the security officers would not necessarily be highly trained but could act only as observers of dangerous situations. As the crew and security personnel board the aircraft they would sign-in to an on-board aircraft processing device, so that the system would be aware of which danger signal personnel were on-board. The personnel capable of signaling danger on-board could sign-in through a danger signal device, like a beeper, cell phone, or other wired or wireless device.

Beyond the human means to present a danger signal, certain aircraft functions would be designated as critical and sensors would communicate dangerous conditions as well. Examples of this might be landing gear failures, hydraulic failures, electrical failures, mechanical failures, air pressure, and oxygen failures.

Danger signal personnel codes, like passwords and answers to personal questions that only the specific danger signal personnel would know would be an important part of the aircraft catastrophic security system, so that secure usage of the danger signal devices would be accomplished. There would be many danger signal personnel and each would have danger signal device codes, like passwords and questions that only the individual danger signal personnel would know. Danger signal devices would be able to verify these passwords and answers and would pass this information on to the on-board aircraft processing device and the external processing device in a complex code scheme, where requests would be made from the on-board aircraft processing device and the external processing device in a totally random manner so that there would be enormous unpredictability associated with the request for the codes, like passwords and answers to

the personal questions. These precautionary precautions would be prevalent in all danger signal input functions in the system, especially after a danger signal would be actuated and the external authorized personnel would be verifying subsequent conditions in the aircraft. If any of the danger signal personnel that the aircraft catastrophic security system knows to be on-board, does not properly respond to the external authorized personnel after a danger signal has been transmitted, then the aircraft catastrophic security system suspects the highest form of danger and acts appropriately thereafter.

Also, as part of the complex code scheme, the danger signal personnel, who are the only ones to know the answers to requests for passwords and the questions being asked, would be required to use great memorization for many possible codes and answers. Much training would be required of the danger signal personnel, to develop their own unique passwords, possibly founded on mathematics, culture, language, and other unpredictable circumstances. In the complex code scheme, answers to questions that danger signal personnel would only have knowledge of would be used in such a way that any hijacker would not easily be able to get those passwords and answers and would have to patiently spend great amounts of time during the flight, in an attempt to obtain the codes. By having the possibility of unknown security personnel on board, a hijacker would not easily know who might have the ability of causing the aircraft to be placed into a dangerous signal state. One of the possible danger signal devices might be a commotion sensor that would pick up extreme emotional signals from the passengers and crew. It is also possible that many passengers, who have reputable and trustworthy backgrounds, could be trained to input danger signals so that hijackers would need to contend with countless and unpredictable possibilities. This would help to build and

maintain the public confidence in the aircraft system in a country. Pilots and crew members would be given the quickest and easiest means to signal danger. They would be the best trained in the passwords and questions that they only know the answers to.

Depending on the circumstances, feedback to the crew of the status of danger  
5 signals may or may not be relayed or may be modified as it would be deemed necessary.  
An on-board aircraft control device is required for controllably operating the aircraft,  
where the external authorized personnel, by use of the external processing device, would  
completely fly the aircraft, or it might be used in a wait-and-see mode, where full control  
is left in the hands of the cockpit, or the aircraft could operate somewhere in between  
10 these possibilities. Cameras on-board the aircraft may be used to determine if hijacking  
is taking place, where the video and audio is transmitted to the external authorized  
personnel. The door to the cockpit and doors on compartments where the crew could be  
housed may need to be locked and highly protected against general entry and bullet  
attack. The status of these doors, like open, closed, broken, and ajar would be signals  
15 that external authorized personnel would be knowledgeable of in the aircraft catastrophic  
security system, by way of the external processing device.

If an aircraft is placed into a controlled, restricted state, the state may be to allow  
only minor adjustment to the aircraft controls or the state may be as simple as forcing the  
aircraft to stay at a certain altitude until the danger signal has been analyzed. However,  
20 before significant control is returned to the aircraft, following a danger signal, all on-  
board danger signal personnel must be in contact with external authorized personnel. No  
matter what state of control that is returned to the aircraft, an aircraft that has received  
even just one accidental danger signal could be dealt with seriously and control should